# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. X. No. 10.] LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1806. [PRICE 1OD.


"The country, to be saved, must have warm advocates and passionate defenders, which a heavy, discon-
"tented acquiescence never can produce. What a base and foolish thing it is for any consolidated body of
"authority to say, or to act as if it said, "I will put my trust, not in mine own virtue, but in your
"patience; I will indulge in effeminacy, in indolence, in corruption; I will give way to all my perverse
"and vicious humours, because you cannot punish me without the hazard of ruining yourselves!"—
BURKE'S WORKS, Vol. VII. p. 364.



## SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

GRANTS TO THE ROYAL FAMILY.——The large grants of public money, made by the *Whig* ministry, just at the close of the last session of parliament, were, by many persons, and by myself amongst others, regarded as being totally unnecessary, seeing that the allowances to the several branches were already so ample. COLONEL WOOD has the merit (a merit that will, 'ere long, be distinguished) of having opposed these grants; and, though his opposition proved ineffectual for the time, it encourages us to hope, that, when the House shall again be *full*, there will be some few members, at least, found to endeavour to cause a revision of this measure, which, I will venture to say, has given a greater shock to men's feelings than any one that has been adopted for many years.——But, at any rate, since the money has been granted, it must be the wish of every good subject to see it judiciously expended; to see it, agreeably to the declarations of the ministers, employed in "supporting the *dignity*" of the several persons, on whom it has been bestowed; and, under the influence of this wish, what must have been the public feeling at reading the following account, ostentatiously published, in all the London news-papers, of the 23d ultimo, under the title of "DUKE OF "CLARENCE'S BIRTH DAY?" To be precise, however, I shall, previous to my inserting the account, just state, that I copy it from the *Courier* news-paper of the day here mentioned.——"The Duke of Cla-
"rence's birth day was celebrated with
"much splendour in Bushy Park, on Thurs-
"day. The grand hall was entirely new
"fitted up, with bronze pilasters, and
"various marble imitations; the ceiling
"very correctly clouded, and the whole
"illuminated with some brilliant patent
"lamps, suspended from a beautiful eagle.
"The dining room in the right wing was
"fitted up in a modern style, with new
"elegant lamps at the different entrances.
"The pleasure ground was disposed for the
"occasion, and the servants had new li-
"veries. In the morning the *Dukes of*
"*York's and Kent's bands arrived in cara-*
"*vans*; after dressing themselves and din-
"ing, they went into the pleasure grounds,
"and played alternately some charming
"pieces. The Duke of Kent's played some
"of the chorusses and movements from
"Haydn's Oratorio of the CREATION,
"arranged, *by command of his Royal High-*
"*ness*, for a band of wind instruments.
"About five o'clock the Prince of Wales,
"the Dukes of York, Kent, Sussex, and
"Cambridge, Colonel Paget, &c. arrived,
"from reviewing THE GERMAN LE-
"GION. After they had dressed for din-
"ner, they walked in the pleasure grounds,
"accompanied by the Lord Chancellor,
"Earl and *Countess* of Athlone and *daugh-*
"*ter*, Lord Leicester, Baron Hotham and
"*Lady*, Baron Eden, the Attorney General,
"Colonels Paget and M'Mahon, Serjeant
"Marshall, and a number of other persons.
"At seven o'clock the second bell announc-
"ed the dinner, when THE PRINCE took
"MRS. JORDAN *by the hand, led her*
"*into the dining room, and seated her at*
"*the head of the table.* The Prince took
"his seat *at her right hand* and the Duke
"of York *at her left*; the Duke of Cam-
"bridge sat next to the Prince, the Duke
"of Kent next to the Duke of York, and
"the Lord Chancellor next to his Royal
"Highness. The DUKE OF CLARENCE
"*sat at the foot of the table.*——It is hard-
"ly necessary to say the table was sump-
"tuously covered with every thing the season
"could afford. The bands played on the
"lawn, close to the dining-room window,
"The populace were permitted to enter the
"pleasure grounds to behold the Royal
"Banquet, while the presence of Messrs.
"Townshend, Sayers, and Macmanus,
"preserved the most correct decorum. The
"Duke's NUMEROUS FAMILY *were*
"*introduced*, and admired by the Prince,
"the Royal Dukes, and the whole com-
"pany; an infant in arms, with a most

" beautiful white head of hair, was brought " into the dining-room by the nursery maid. " After dinner the Prince gave " The Duke " " of Clarence," which was drank with " three times three. The Duke gave " " The King," which was drank in a si- " milar manner. A discharge of cannon " from the lawn followed. " The Queen " " and Princesses."—" The Duke of " " York and the Army." His Royal " Highness's band then struck up *his cele-* " *brated march.*"——Now, first observing, that I do not mean to give this paragraph as a narrative of real facts, but merely as a publication that I have found in the news-paper above-named, and as a statement which I wish to see contradicted by order of his Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, or of some of his brothers; thus observing, and explicitly stating, that my object is to remove the evil impression, which such a publication must necessarily tend to produce upon the minds of a people, who, *by the express command of His Majesty*, have read to them from the pulpit, four times a year, a long exhortation against vice and immorality, and who have fresh in their minds the large grants of money recently made for the declared purpose of enabling the several branches of the Royal Family " to support the *dignity* of their station;" thus previously observing, I would beg leave, as a beginning of my comments upon the publication before me, to ask the writer of it, *what march* he means, when he talks of the " *celebrated* march of the *Duke of* " *York?*" And, I would further ask him, what necessity there was in a publication of this sort, to remind the people of England of the Duke of York's *marches?* And why he could not have so far got the better of his too obvious disposition, as to suffer those ' *cele-* " *brated*" marches to rest quiet and unalluded to?——The representing of the oratorio of the CREATION, and arranged by the Duke of Kent, too, applied to the purpose of ushering in the " NUMEROUS FA- " MILY of the Duke of Clarence;" the thus representing the Duke of Kent as employed in an act, whereby the procreation of a brood of illegitimate children is put in comparison with the great work of the Almighty, is, in this writer, an act of the most insidious disloyalty, and of blasphemy the most daring. We all know, that the Duke of Clarence is not married, and that, therefore, if he had children, those children must be bastards, and that the father must be guilty of a crime, in the eye of the law as well as of religion, and that he would exhibit a striking example of that vice and immorality, which his royal father's proclamation, so regularly read to us by our pastors, commands us to shun and to abhor, and enjoins upon the magistrates to mark out and to punish whereever they shall find them existing among us. While we hear this command so often repeated to us, and know that, from the form in which it is conveyed, it comes immediately from His Majesty's mind and conscience, can we possibly suppose, that he would wink at acts, in his own family, such as are described by this writer? And when to this consideration we add the many others that present themselves upon the subject, can we hesitate in declaring, that to represent the Duke of Clarence as having a " numerous " family of children" is foully to slander his Royal Highness, and that, further to represent him as *ostentatiously* exhibiting this " numerous family" in public, and in the immediate presence of all his royal brothers and of the Lord Chancellor of England, and other of the nobles, is to accuse him of a gratuitous and wanton insult against the laws, the manners, and the morals of the country. ——This representation and accusation I must and I do, therefore, consider as *false*; and, I am confirmed in this my opinion, when I hear the same writer assert, that the Prince of Wales *took Mother Jordan by the hand*, and, in the presence of a *Countess*, a *Countess's daughter*, and a *Baroness*, *seated her at the head of the table*, taking his place upon her right hand, his royal brothers arranging themselves, according to their rank, on both sides of the table, the *post of honour* being nearest Mother Jordan, who, the last time I saw her, cost me eighteen-pence in her character of Nell Jobson!——This part of the account proves the falsehood of the whole. But, though, amongst persons, who are at all acquainted with the characters of the illustrious personages, who are, by this writer, represented as having been actors in the scene, there can be no doubt that the whole of the representation is false, more especially when we take into view the pious and strenuously-enforced precepts of the royal father's proclamation; yet, amongst that part of His Majesty's subjects, who know nothing of the manners of the great, except what they learn through the channel of the newspapers, doubts upon the subject may prevail, nay, such persons may *believe* the representation of the COURIER, particularly as it has been given, and *in nearly the same words, too*, by all the other newspapers; and, therefore, being fully convinced, that the representation must produce, in whatever degree it is believed, an impression extremely injurious to the characters of the parties

named; not less injurious to the manners and morals of the people; and, eventually, greatly dangerous to the stability of the throne, for this plain reason, that the most virtuous part of the people, that part of them in whose minds truth and justice are predominant, that part of them on whom alone reliance could safely be placed, would infallibly be the most disgusted, and the most alienated by the belief of such a representation; being fully convinced of these important truths, I venture to beseech the royal parties, whose names have been so unwarrantably brought before the public, in the above-cited publication, to cause a formal contradiction thereof to be publickly made; I venture to beseech them to reflect on the fatal consequences, which have uniformly ensued, and especially in recent instances, from proceedings such as are described in this publication, and to remember, that to be blameless, as they, doubtless, are, in this and in all other cases of the kind, is not enough, unless they are also thought to be blameless; I venture to beseech them well to weigh the words of my motto, taken from the writings of one of the wisest of men, and to consider, whether, though the above-cited publication is a tissue of falsehoods, their permitting it to remain uncontradicted may not expose them, amongst the uninformed part of the people, to the imputation of acting upon a principle such as that in my motto described; I venture to beseech them, above all things, to reflect upon what must be the natural and inevitable effect produced in the minds of the people, if they were once to believe that any portion of the grants made out of the taxes, in times like the present, was expended upon objects such as those described in this poisonous publication; and, lastly, as I have, in proportion to my means and my capacity, done as much as any private individual ever did in support of the throne and the reputation of the royal family, I hope it will not be thought presumptuous, that I now make them a tender of my pages and my pen, for the purpose of making and promulgating that contradiction, which every *truly* loyal subject is so anxiously desirous to see.

WHIGGISM.——It will be recollected, that, in page 161 of the present volume, I took occasion, in speaking of the conduct of the present "Whig ministry," relative to the press, to say, that I disliked the *Whig principle* (supposing it, for argument's sake, still to have been alive) "having ob "served, that *all* those measures which "have proved greatly and permanently "disgraceful to England, originated with "the pretenders to exclusive patriotism, "who called themselves Whigs."——A commentator upon this passage appeared in page 239; and another, taking courage from my silence, has made his appearance in the present sheet.——Both these writers seem to be perfectly willing to give up the *pretenders* to Whiggism, as the basest of apostates; but neither of them attempts to *prove*, that any real Whigs (according to their notion of the import of the term) have ever existed. They maintain the *theory* of Whiggism, but have no scruple to give up the *practice*——With such conceding opponents it is difficult to know what to do. They slip from one's fingers like an eel; and there is no answering them otherwise than by repeating and backing one's own assertions.——To the Whigs we do not owe either the *Bill of Rights*, or that other great security for liberty the Act of *Habeas Corpus*; but, we owe to them the frequent violation of both. We owe to them (as is observed by a correspondent, whose letter I cannot publish) the *Septennial Law*; the *Excise Laws* and the recent attempt at extending them to private houses; the Germanized system of *keeping up a standing army in time of peace*; the constant and uniform *rejection of pension and place bills*; the primary *increase of the civil-list*; the *Walpolian system of influence and corruption*; the sullen and sulky rejection of various propositions *for inquiry into their mal-administration*; *the introducing of foreign troops into the kingdom*; and, if we owe to them the Revolution of 1688, we owe it to their love of power, and to the same passion in them we owe that terrible evil, that more than a balance against all the good they ever pretended to wish to produce; we owe to them the origin and the maintenance of the *National Debt*, since the creation of which *no House of Commons has ever refused to vote whatever sums of money any minister has thought proper to demand*.——Was I right in saying, that to the Whigs we owe all the measures that have proved greatly and permanently injurious and disgraceful to England? Had I reason, or had I not, to dislike the *principle* of Whiggism, which principle, as evinced in their actions, is an adherence to place and power, though at the expence of all their professions?——The correspondent, in the present sheet, tells me, that the main principle of the Whigs is, that *a jealousy should always exist with respect to the power of the crown, and that endeavours should constantly be made to check that power.* Whether he means to include the members

of the Whig Club, who are also members of the present administration; whether he means to include these gentlemen in his description of apostates, I cannot pretend to say; but, if he does *not*, let me ask him, whether he thinks the operation of this main principle of Whiggism has been very visible in the abandoning of the measure relative to a *Military Council*; in the declaration of Mr. Fox respecting *the restoration of Hanover as a sine-qua-non of peace*; in the *exemption of His Majesty's funded property from the Income Tax*; or, in *the recent grants to the Royal Family, notwithstanding the existence of those funds?* And, if he *does* mean to include them in his description of apostate Whigs, I would beg leave to ask him, whether, after their twenty years of vehement professions, the people will ever be foolish enough again to put their trust in the professions of any man upon earth, who shall call himself a Whig?——As I can go no further without an answer upon these points, I shall here take leave of the subject, for the present, with a remark that will, I should think, give these correspondents an opportunity of coming to a mutual explanation.——My former correspondent (pray look at page 240) asks me, "Are the "principles, Sir, that produced the great "and glorious revolution, and placed upon "the throne of the realms OUR PRESENT "*illustrious and beloved Monarch*, as the "*guardian of his people's rights and liber-*"*ties*, principles to be *combatted by you?*" This is to say: Whig principles produced the revolution, the revolution placed the present king upon the throne; therefore, Whig principles caused the present king to be king; and, of course, if I persist in expressing my dislike of Whig principles, I express my dislike of the present king! Admirable logician! Candid, and, above all things, *manly* disputant! But, let us hear what the *other* Whig, in the present sheet, says about the "*present king*." He asserts, with no less boldness than his brother Whig makes his assertions, that "the "*present reign* has been a reign of *To-*"*ryism*;" so that, if both speak truth, the Whig principles that produced the glorious revolution that placed the present king upon the throne, have been productive of nothing but Toryism, and that this Toryism has been "the guardian of the people's rights and "liberties!" The Whig in the present sheet calls upon me, in a manner somewhat triumphant, to answer his brother Whig's observations; but, surely any further answer, on my part, may be well dispensed with, until the gentlemen have been able to reconcile their own assertions as to the present reign; yet I am aware, that the intelligent reader will have already perceived, that the difference is easily accounted for by merely supposing, that the former correspondent is a Whig *in place*, and the latter a Whig *out of place*.——The object of the remarks first offered upon this subject, was, to expose the folly of those, who, though very good men, and, in every other case, very sensible men, suffered themselves to be cajoled and deluded by the hypocritical use of a catch-word; a word which I hope to see scouted out of conversation, and consigned to the works of those writers, who may hereafter moralize upon the political impositions practised upon mankind.

NATIONAL DEBT.——In the present sheet, will be found a letter, signed DECIUS, upon this subject. He begins by talking of the "*flagrant injustice*" of my proposition for disloading ourselves of this unbearable burden, without, however, making any attempt to confute any one of the arguments, by which the *justice* of that proposition was, in the preceding volume, under the title of "FATE OF THE FUNDS," endeavoured to be maintained.—— He asks, *what good* I propose by the annihilation of the debt; and this I look upon as rather hard, after I have so repeatedly described the *evils* inseparable from the debt's existence.——He proceeds on to show what embarrassments would arise in the money market, *if the whole of the principal were paid off at once*; but, he must do this out of mere sport; for, I have had in view the destruction of that vile thing called the money market; and, never, in all I have written upon the subject, did an idea escape so full of absurdity, as that the principal could possibly be *paid off*.—— This writer (and I thank him for it) has exposed the folly of regarding the national debt as *a source of revenue*; but, does he not, in some measure, fall into the folly exposed, by arguing, that the debt is become necessary to the support of *charitable institutions?*——His close is admirable. His exposition of the shocking absurdity of seizing a part of every man's real property, in order to liquidate the debt, is perfect in all its parts; and, without disparagement to the Edinburgh Review, it very far surpasses the remarks, made in that work, upon the SPEECH, which was intended to be spoken, and which was really published, by the Bishop of Landaff. The profundity of this part of his letter compensates for the banker-like notions of the former part, and fixes the writer, in my opinion, as a man who ought to have answered my arguments in

support of the *justice* of ceasing to pay interest upon the debt, supposing such a measure to be *necessary* to prevent the ruin of the nation.——This gentleman, like all the others, who have taken the same side, avoids asserting, *that we are able to go on in our present way*. He leaves the subject, as to that point, where he finds it. He seems to rest upon a hope not very strong, and the grounds of which are not clearly conceived in his own mind. So I, for my part, cannot rest. Whatever *justice* there may be in *throwing the burden upon posterity*, the *impolicy* of it is, in my opinion, certain and evident. I wish to see, with my own eyes, the way clear for posterity; nor can I bring my mind to draw one moment's consolation from any thing to arise out of the chapter of accidents. By the annihilation of her debt, England would, I am fully persuaded, be enabled to laugh at her enemies, however numerous and however mighty; and, until I am convinced of the contrary, I shall continue to wish for that annihilation, and shall applaud every measure for curtailing the interest upon the debt.

NEGOCIATIONS FOR PEACE.—Speculations on this subject are useless; and the only reason for my introducing the topic here, is, to have another opportunity of expressing my hope, that, for the reasons given in the excellent letter in page 275 of the present volume, the *restoration of Hanover* will form no part of our claims. I beg leave again to refer the reader to that letter, and to ask himself seriously, what must be our fate, if such an object be introduced into the discussions at Paris?——This squares, too, so excellently well with the idea of a *fourth coalition* against France, of which, according to the apparent opinions of our sapient political writers, *Prussia* is to be a member! There appears to be no probability of such a coalition; and, if there were, I think, we might rest assured, that more dethronements would speedily take place. The gentlemen of the Morning Post and the Courier talk it well about "the "*untouched* armies of Prussia;" but, the question is, how much touching would those armies bear? The "KNIGHT OF THE "POLAR STAR" may exhaust himself beyond the reviving powers of brandy, though his whole pension were expended in that commodity; but, he will never succeed in persuading me, that there are now greater means of combatting Buonaparté than there were a year ago. The fact is, that, from the folly and baseness of others, the Emperor of France is become the master of the continent; and, every hope that is excited in our breasts as to what can be done in that quarter, must tend to slacken those exertions of our own, on which alone our safety now depends. The battle, whether peace take place now, or not, remains to be fought between England and France. We have, with proper measures, ample means both of defence and offence; but, if we adopt not such measures, we share the fate of all those nations which, one after another, have fallen under the dominion of France.

"DELICATE INVESTIGATION."——This is, probably, the last time, that I shall find it necessary to trouble the reader with any remarks upon this subject. It is, indeed, exhausted, and one can only repeat one's expressions of regret, that any man capable of putting words into sentences, should have so far disgraced the art of writing and of printing as to have resorted to subterfuges and falsehoods, such as those which I have exposed in the writer of the Morning Post, by whom, be it always remembered, this, for him, ill-fated discussion was provoked.—— There have been, since his assertion (a *false* one, I presume) that *the report had been made to the Princess of Wales*, two principal points in dispute; to wit; the "*trifling* "*levities*" that he talked of, and *the reason why the report was not published*. Upon the former I have stung and goaded him, in all manner of ways, in order to obtain from him a definition of what *he* means by the phrase, "*trifling levities*;" but, all in vain; he will not define; he will not tell us what he means; and so we must leave him.—— Upon the other point I have been equally unsuccessful. No plain reason will he give us; but, as it is not here a mere matter of verbal meaning, we will once more hear what he says, throwing in a few words, here and there, for the purpose of avoiding the trouble of a commentary subjoined.——In his paper of the 1st instant he says:——

"We come next to the point of publication.
"The public will recollect, that we always
"have urged the publication on the broad
"ground of the general justice of the case,
"and the full satisfaction due to the people
"of England. We have said that the com-
"missioners were the proper persons *to*
"*prepare* the report for publication; and
"our reason for saying so was particularly,
"that we were informed that many parts of
"the infamous calumnies were advanced
"in language *so gross and disgusting*, that
"the evidence which was the most material
"part of the proceedings (the result being
"*already public*, to the amount of a full
"and *complete acquittal*), *could possibly be*
"*made public only* BY SELECTION, *and*

" *in substance.*" [What! the *language* so *gross* and *disgusting* as to be unfit to meet the eye of decency! The language of *evidence* too! *What* could these *filthy* witnesses have to give *evidence of*? Tell us *that*, thou able advocate!] " To make that selection, to condense that substance, and " to put the publication in every way in the " shape that *it ought to go forth in*, the " commissioners alone appeared to us qualified. This writer would infer, that because the Princess of Wales has not published the report, she is guilty of all that " has been laid to her charge." [False. I never regarded it as *a fact* that the report had been *delivered* to her, and I do not regard it so now.] " He says, there is reason " upon reason, why the Prince of Wales " should not publish it. Does he include " among these reasons the urgent advice he " was so friendly as to give to his Royal " Highness in his last number, to cause the " publication to be made; the information " he communicated of the delay of the publication being imputed intirely to his " Royal Highness, and the assurance that " the most unreserved and most painful liberties were taken with his Royal Highness's name in consequence? We should consider this as a reason upon reason why " the Prince of Wales should become the " publisher, that is, why he should use all " the means in his power to cause the report to be published. It is said the informers dare not publish a relation of " their depositions. Let them put the facts " in the shape of an information before a " magistrate, and they may do it with safety." [No magistrate would *take* the deposition; and, if he did, no printer would publish it.] " But considering the extraordinary kindness this writer has shewn " for these meritorious and much injured " persons, it seems rather odd, that they " have not given him some few hints which " he might use for their advantage, without " subjecting himself or them to the penalties of the law. Will he tell us why " they have not? As to the Princess of " Wales, the publication is now essential to " her chiefly with a view to the punishment " of her calumniators, and the exposure of " the criminal designs formed against her. " HER INNOCENCE IS ALREADY " DECLARED, AND UNIVERSALLY " BELIEVED. Why she does not publish " the report *I do not pretend to say.* We " are not informed whether the report was " accompanied with the evidence, or any " part of the evidence *is what is most* " [And yet you would *select* and *condense* it; that is to say, you would *garble* it!] " The ACQUITTAL IS ALREADY PUBLIC AND " UNCONTRADICTED. The commissioners are the proper persons to prepare " the evidence for publication. To them " the public ought to look for it; and according as any one has weight and influence, and authority with them, which " the Prince of Wales may most particularly be supposed to have, he ought to press " them to make the publication." All this is really too pitiful; and it were a shame to give it circulation, except for the purpose of exposing the falsehood and the folly of this pretender to an intimacy with the great. ——As usual, he concludes with some most monstrous misrepresentations of my remarks; upon which, from the high respect for the parties whom he accuses me of intending to defame, I shall just observe, that my words will, by all the torturing that they can undergo, bear no such construction as that which he has put upon them.—— Again, like CALIBAN, in his complaints against Trinculo, he invokes the vengeance of the Attorney General upon me. " Lo, " lo again, how he mocks me! Wilt thou " let him, my lord? Bite him to death, I " pr'ythee!" To which the Attorney General might answer, in the words of Stephano, " Oh, that a monster should be such " a natural!"

JEWISH PREDOMINANCE.——Under this title, some very interesting observations will be found in a letter, in a subsequent page of this sheet.——MR. BROTHERS, some time ago, predicted, that we should all be in Jerusalem, or, in Palestine, at least, on, or before, the 1st of September, 1806; and, really, from the tenour of the newspaper paragraphs of late, and from the endless recurrence of Jewish names in high places, a doubt might be excited, in minds a little flighty, whether we had not actually arrived! ——Where all this is to end, on this side of the channel, it would be hard to say; but, amongst the many acts of the Emperor Napoleon that I disapprove of, I am glad to find two, whereof to express my decided approbation, namely, his measures for compelling the Jews to work like other men, and for preventing the blood of the French from being mixed with that of the Blacks, and I heartily wish that similar measures were adopted in England.

*Botley, September 4th,* 1806.

---

NATIONAL DEBT.

SIR,— Before proposing the annihilation of the National Debt by an act of the most

flagrant injustice, or attempting it by means that would at least be highly inconvenient, not to say altogether impracticable, it appears to me to be incumbent on yourself and your correspondents to point out what advantages would accrue to the nation, and in what respect its condition would be bettered, by adopting the measures that are proposed. Nothing can be more simple, nor more easy to carry into execution, than the mode you propose for effecting this object; but whether upon the whole we should be substantially benefitted by it, is, to say the least of it, highly problematical.—Let us suppose, what at least you, Sir, must acknowledge as the most desirable mode, were it a practicable one, of exonerating the public from the payment of its annuitants, that the government had repaid to every man the amount of the capital sum with which he had purchased his annuity. By this operation it is evident, the public would immediately be relieved from the payment of the interest of such money; and thenceforth, by a sum equal in amount to the interest of the debt, its expenditure would be diminished. But at the same time that its expenditure was diminished, so would be diminished, in how great a degree it is impossible to say, the aggregate capacity of the public for yielding money in the way of taxes. It would clearly be going too far, to say that the nation, by paying twenty millions annually, creates to itself a source of revenue, yielding in the way of taxes, a sum more than equal to that twenty millions. Yet there have not been wanting persons, who have asserted, and certainly it could be so only in the above view, that the existence of the National Debt is a position of abstract benefit to the community: that is to say, that the National Debt is absolutely so much national wealth. This is evidently very absurd, but probably not the greatest absurdity that this subject has given birth to. But still I think it seems very questionable, whether if, by sudden operation, the National Debt were to be extinguished, the wealth of the nation, meaning by its wealth, its capacity of yielding taxes, would not by such a measure be diminished. A temporary diminution in its wealth would certainly be experienced. If you put the annuitant in possession of his principal, what is he to do with it? How is he to employ it? And being thus incapable of employing it, how is he to pay taxes? And who, upon the supposition of his keeping his money at home, unless by the most vexatious inquisitorial procedure, is to know what is his capacity for yielding taxes? If he can no longer make it serve as a source of revenue, by putting it out at interest, he must live upon the principal, and may live to see it exhausted. That he must live upon the principal is evident: for it cannot be supposed that immediate employment would be found for the vast sums that would thus be set free. That a demand for it does not exist in any other way, the very circumstance of its being vested in the funds is a sufficient proof. The demand for capital to be employed in the way of trade, is limited by the amount of the trade that a nation has occasion for; and the effect of paying off the National Debt, would rather be to diminish than enhance this demand; since, by rendering frugality necessary, it would necessarily diminish the consumption of articles of commerce. Our very manners, too, and the constitution of the community, has adapted itself so much to, and is so intimately involved in the existence of the National Debt, that its sudden annihilation, however just the means by which it might be effected, could scarcely fail of being productive of the most serious and extensive inconvenience. What would then become of our London Bankers, our Insurance offices, our Charitable Institutions, and so forth? Does not their very existence depend upon the security and facility with which they can derive a revenue from the money invested in their hands? It would be utterly impracticable to such bodies as these, assuming that the demand existed for it, to employ an extensive capital in trade: the care, the hazard, the length of time that must necessarily elapse before any return is made, all forbid it. I do not mean to assert, that these circumstances would, of themselves, afford a sufficient reason for the perpetuation of the National Debt, but they are merely mentioned as circumstances not altogether unworthy consideration in the discussion of this subject, and may serve, in some degree at least, to reconcile us to a burthen, which, while it is accompanied with so much real inconvenience, has at least the semblance of not being altogether destitute of advantages.—As to the means that are proposed to be employed for effecting this great object, taking it for granted that it is desirable, it cannot have failed to have given the dispassionate part of your readers considerable pain to have observed, coming from you, the recommendation of a measure, fraught with such flagrant injustice, as that which you propose: not merely on its own account, but because it must tend to diminish the effect which your writings on other subjects cannot fail to have, and to which they are so eminently intitled. You demand

of the government, and most justly, and most forcibly too, the punishment of peculators: and at that very same time, perhaps in another part of the same work, you are inviting and encouraging that same government, not merely to do a trifling act of injustice, but to become themselves the most aggravated species of robbers: for surely it will not be attempted to be maintained, that the magnitude of the crime at all diminishes its turpitude? You are on all other subjects a model of consistency: I think it becomes you to reconcile sentiments that are upon the face of them so compleatly inconsistent. It is too flimsy a sophism to produce conviction in the minds of any of your readers that are worth convincing, to say, that because people have dabbled in the funds, that is to say, bought in and sold out when they thought it would be for their benefit, that therefore, they have committed a material crime, and ought, as a punishment for it, to be deprived of the whole of the money that has been made the instrument of such crime. Do not people with a view to profit buy and sell land, and all other articles of commerce? And ought they, on that account, to be declared to have forfeited the articles thus bought and sold? The Government, or, to speak more correctly, the mass of the people do not suffer by this trafficking in the funds, and where then is a justice of selecting such traffickers as objects of its vengeance? If the nation is not to pay *money* borrowed, neither should it, by parity of reason, pay for *money's worth*: how much for its easement would it be were it to say to merchants who had furnished it with stores, or ship-builders who have built ships for it,—"No you have been trafficking with, and thinking to make profit by us, therefore you have no claim whatever to be paid." If the present debt is to be extinguished by this means, who, upon any future emergency, will become its creditors? Or how will credit be to be obtained for such commodities as we have no other means of procuring but upon credit?—It may be said, that in France, and that more than once, a spunge has been passed over the debt of the State, and yet notwithstanding the government has been able to obtain credit from its subjects. So it has: but is France, in its present regenerated state, a nation under whose example we can shelter ourselves from the infamy of such a measure? And in what way have those subsequent loans been obtained? spontaneously? Certainly not, but by irresistible power; the reflection of being exempt from which may afford us no small source of satisfaction.—The advocates for the annihilation of the National Debt, triumphantly talk of the absurdity of one part of the nation owing a debt to another part, or rather, to give it the greater appearance of absurdity, of the nation owing a debt to itself. But where the *real* absurdity of this lies, passes my comprehension. Would it be absurd to talk of one part of a family owing a debt to another part of the same family? Certainly not. And if in this instance, as well as in abundance of others, we were in the habit of considering the nation at large, not merely as a being *sui generis*, and therefore requiring a peculiar mode of treatment, and changing the nature of words when applied to it, as for instance, injustice into justice, but differing merely from an ordinary family in the amount of its numbers, our judgment as to national measures would not probably be less correct, nor our affairs conducted upon principles less consistent with the great interests of society.—Your correspondent s plan, in your last Register, appears to carry with it more the air of unfeasibility and absurdity, than injustice. He sets out with complaining of the heavy burthens to which we are already subject, and makes this a ground for paying off the debt, by way of exempting ourselves from a part of those burthens. In the common course of life, it would appear somewhat absurd, were we to hear of a man who was very deeply involved in debt, his receipts scarcely sufficient to meet his ordinary expenditure, to seive upon the moment when there happened to be extraordinary demands upon his income, to pay off the whole of his debts. If it would be impracticable for an individual to act thus, so would it be for the nation. If we are incapable of paying the interest of the debt, and so we are represented to be, we must clearly be incapable of paying the principal. Admitting, for the purpose of the argument, the proposed plan was *practicable*, yet still I see not the *policy* of carrying it into effect. On common principles of justice, I see not the demand there is upon us to reduce ourselves to the brink of ruin, to exonerate our posterity from bearing a part in those burthens, the whole of which we have not created, and are therefore entitled to act with regard to our successors, as our predecessors acted towards us. The complaint is, that we are already squeezed up to our capacity of endurance, and yet your correspondent cries to be still more severely squeezed. This may be very commendable stoicism, but a stoicism in the practice of which, he will find, I fear, but few imitators. *Money* for the proposed purpose evidently exists not. The public creditor must be paid then in

noney's worth. In the instance of great and proprietors, the must give up the requisite portion of their land: some at least of these portions would come to be transferred o ignorant men, helpless widows, or trustees already, perhaps, overburthened with their own business. And are they to cultivate the and thus forced upon them? Would not his endanger a famine? What would be he value of land were such an arrangement o be determined on? What the distributi- n of property after it it had been carried into effect? Would it not be the means of throwing a larger proportion into the hands of the opulent, and of their possessing a arger share than they now do, of the inconvenience of which we already affect to complain? By this means one part of the nation would be impoverished, without enriching the other part; its liberty would be endangered by the accumulation of property in the hands of the already opulent, and its very existence be brought into jeopardy, by diminishing its capacity for resistance, which is already found not more than equal to withstand the attacks made upon it.—I am, &c.

*Aug. 29th*, 1806. DECIUS.

---

## Whiggism.

"There is a dignity in the warm passions of a "Whig, which is never to be found in the cold "stance of a Tory: In the one nature is only "heated, in the other she is poisoned: the instant the "former has it in his power to punish, he feels a "disposition to forgive; but the *canine venom* of "the latter knows no relief but in *revenge!*"

Sir;——I fully intended to have troubled you, before this time, with some observations on your late violent philippic against the Whigs; and as I have been hitherto prevented, it gave me much pleasure to observe that this subject has not escaped the animadversion of another correspondent. However manfully you may throw down the guantlet, and defy all the host of whigs, I shrewdly suspect that there is some reasoning in the *Whigs'* letter that will require all your ingenuity to answer: but as you promise to expose, in your next number, the futility of this correspondent's arguments, I am very desirous of having the matter fully discussed: I shall therefore make no apology in requesting your attention to some things, that were not noticed by the *Whig*.——A whig and a tory (according to my understanding of the terms) must possess dispositions and temperaments diametrically opposite to each other; and therefore I have selected my motto, as happily illustrative of their different characters. The genuine whig approves a mixed government, composed of several checks; and is always jealous of the power of the crown; whilst the tory would prefer an absolute monarchy, and is constantly endeavouring to enlarge the power and prerogative of the crown:——the former is liberal in his ideas respecting those who dissent from the established church, and would generally promote an abolition of all tests;——the latter erects a lofty fence around his church, and would gladly exclude every nonconformist from the participation of all its present advantages, as well as from the expectation of all its future rewards! Human nature is ever liable to error; and, on every subject left to the fallible judgement of man, there will be a diversity of opinions: especially in politics, where men are accustomed to discuss the nature of the government and constitution under which they live. In your future lucubrations on whiggism, permit me, sir, seriously to request that you will never forget, that whiggism itself, is not, cannot be blameable for the apostacy of its professors. You very well know, that the truth of christianity could not be substantiated, were this mode of reasoning allowed. There would have been no necessity, for my making this observation to a mind so acute as yours, were we not all so prone in the warm pursuit of a favourite theory, to seize with avidity on every circumstance, so that it *only appears* to shew them on our side of the question, or to invalidate the cause of our opponent.——And has not a man, of tory principles, intermeddled in the affairs of state for the last seventy years?—— Pray, sir, do you intend to maintain that the Marquis of Bute was a Whig? And my Lord Liverpool, shall we donominate him a Whig, Mr. Cobbett?——Indeed it is well known that toryism has been the fashionable political sentiment during the whole of the present reign: the thriving sentiment that has invariably conducted its professors to emoluments and honors! Mr. Pitt, I very readily acknowledge, was originally a whig: and never did a light more brilliant and promising dawn upon our political hemisphere, than on his first appearance above the horizon: but alas! it proved to be the mere coruscation of a comet, instead of the steady lustre of a fixed star. I am almost ashamed to particularize any of the transactions of this reign, as *peculiarly* evincing a predilection for tory principles. However, I cannot refrain from asking you two questions: 1. whether taxing the Americans, who had no opportunity by their representatives, or otherwise, of objecting to the tax, originated in whig or tory principles?——2. With

which system the commencement of the late war with France is the most congenial? ——If we ever live to see an impartial narative of these times, the question will be decided: and on that decision would I stake my life!—I do certainly expect from your masterly pen some strong objections against whiggism; and forcible must they be, to induce me to abandon those principles, to which I consider this nation indebted for all the personal and public freedom that it enjoys! But, as you dwell "upon all those "measures, that have proved greatly and "permanently injurious and digraceful to "England," do not forget the revolution of 1688, to which the *Whig* alludes; nor the act of succession; nor the many beneficial results that have issued from those glorious proceedings! Should you persist in your intention of endeavouring to make us weary of defending the cause of Whiggism, I trust, that an abler pen will advocate its defence; but, at any rate, my own sincere, though weak endeavours shall not be wanting to the cause!—And do you think Lord Melville an honester man than any one of the present ministers?—O, fie, Mr. Cobbett, fie. Still, sir, I can conscientiously return you my sincere thanks for your exertions hitherto:—let patriotism and not captiousness be the ruling motive of your conduct; and this country will be more indebted to you, than Rome ever was to the elder Cato! I am, &c. A FRIEND TO FREEDOM.—*August* 20, 1806.

---

JEWISH PREDOMINANCE.

"————Non possum ferre, Quirites,
Græcam urbem."————JUVENAL.

SIR,—I observe you have not inserted in your Register the dazzling description given by a certain Jew broker of his new palace in Surry, and the magnificent feast he lately gave there to our princes and nobles. Perhaps you think it has been sufficiently published already; and indeed I must confess it has for the last ten days, thrown the affairs of Europe very much into the back ground. But there are so many interesting considerations arising out of all this splendour, that I am persuaded you will not refuse me a corner of your paper to moralize upon it.—But you will observe in passing, that I do not exactly say the description in question was written by the broker himself, any more than that he built his own barouche, or engraved that portrait of him which appears in the shops with both arms loaded, not with omnium, but with vast rolls of his public charities and contributions. So far from being the author himself, I do not suspect him of having ever written a sentence in any language whatever. But it is an additional proof of his liberal spirit, that he exercises and rewards the talents of our writers, architects, painters, poets, and musicians, and even charms colonel Pattypan himself to lay down the truncheon and repair to Morden with the roiling pin.—I am not ignorant that Mr. Cumberland, in his Life, solemnly declares that he was not paid a farthing by the synagogue, or any individual Jew, for writing his comedy of that name. This looks like an imputation on the liberality of the race; but Mr. Cumberland should consider, that he has indiscreetly over-done the part; and, that a Jew who gives away his money for the mere pleasure of doing good, without shew or profit, is such a monstrous caricature as no real Jew can see without contempt. It is only with us simpler Christians that the play has had any influence, and I will not dispute with Mr. Cumberland, that it may have assisted us to shake off those suspicions and prejudices which so long held our Jewish inmates in the condition of rats, always persecuted but never extirpated, nor prevented from purloining our victuals.—'Till lately, the richest Jews amongst us affected poverty for fear of envy, and eat their unleavened cakes and counted their usuries in secret. But now they are the companions of our feasts, the pride of our assemblies, the arbiters of our amusements:—This speculation becomes important, when it is considered, that the remarkable changes we have spoken of are chiefly connected with the growth of the commercial spirit among us. Indeed the treatment of the Jews from the beginning, has always been milder in proportion to the commercial advancement of the states in which they lived. How sadly forlorn were they, for example, in the pasturing countries of Assyria and Babylon! How different there the state of the homeless exile, hanging up his harp in despair on the willows, from that of our modern broker, with the military bands of a whole county cheering his feasts on the banks of the Wandle? And, in the same way, France is now giving us a pleasing proof, if any were wanting, of the lamentable condition of her trade, by the harsh measures she is taking with her Jewish citizens. Bonaparte must needs inquire *why they do not work* and conform to the institutions of his other subjects; whilst, in our commercial state, if they are *wealthy*, no other question is asked. They may then dig wells, and build houses, and plant trees, on the very soil where our boasted Nelson was wont to relax himself (in far humbler stile, alas!) from his severer labours!—It is

likewise obvious, that Bonaparte's funding system must be very different from ours, else he would not dare to discompose the Jews. Let Moses Jacobson say what he pleases about tilling the rocks of Palestine, it is certain the race are not of a temper to submit to agriculture or mechanical trades; and let Bonaparte do what he can, he never shall make them regular artizans, any more than Pharaoh could make them brick makers. We see that every soul of them, male or female, takes with alacrity to traffick, from the children that sell shoe-strings and pick pockets near the Bank, up to the richest of the race.—It is all a nursery of commerce; the fountain of brokerage, exchange and barter; and the living principle of all kinds of jobbing and huckstery. Tremble, ye statesmen, to touch this hallowed confederation? A whole ministry may be turned out (all but the commander in chief) and the nation proceed no worse, but the hair of a Jew's beard must not be singed, lest our gold become paper, our paper assignats, lest our stocks vanish into air, and loans become impossible.—Let us not be stunned here with the cry of illiberality. I despise no man for his country, lineage, or religion. If a German, a Frenchman, a Spaniard, or a man of any other country settle amongst us, he soon coalesces and becomes amalgamated with the rest of us, and at any rate his progeny is sure to be English. But a Jew is of no nation, and his children are Jews, never uniting and coalescing with any other race, but making it their religion and their study to remain distinct and separate from all. They are united together though spread in all countries, a mass widely extending amongst other materials, but gravitating uniformly and alone to its own centre. Such an enormous confederacy, like the Jesuits of late, all engaged in one pursuit, and held together by perpetual correspondence, might well be the object of jealousy, but surely neither requires nor deserves superior indulgence, or fostering kindness —It is far from me, Sir, to envy any man his riches, neither is my bile moved by the pomp of a Jew broker. But I am grieved that any one should have gained the most amiable and most accomplished of princes to decorate his triumph. Wealth, especially in a land of trade, must always draw its full share of deference and attention, and be sufficiently admired by the multitude. It is, therefore, the proper glory, and, I may say, the duty of our prince, when at any time he steps out of his court, to bend his countenance and favour so as to reward distinguished merit, or to illustrate that which is obscure, I should delight to see him visiting the humble dwelling of DAVID LEVI, or any other Jew eminent for learning and intellect, instead of swelling the state of Abraham Goldsmidt. Or when high rank requires the vicissitudes of humbler society, I am not singular in saying, that I would rather see the heir apparent at the Boar's Head in Eastcheap, (like his great predecessor) "touching the base string of humility" with another Poins, than worshipping (like princes of another race) a thing of gold But I believe it was an unconsidered and good natured act, and certainly he did not suspect that our prints should be taught to publish to all the world, that he condescended, at a Jewish feast, with the High Chancellor and other great ministers of the king about him, *to pronounce studied eulogiums* on exchange brokers, and to mix his princely voice with Jews and Jewesses in singing the song of Moses in their tabernacles.—I am, Sir, with very great respect, your obedient humble servant, ETHNICUS.

---

MODERN AGRICULTURE.

SIR,——As every exertion of the human mind ought to have for its object general utility, I cannot conceive that purpose to be more effectually attained in a periodical work, than by the free admission of any opinions which may be offered upon subjects of great national importance. Of this description none are superior to the primary source of all our strength; namely, Agriculture, in which is comprehended the production of food, animal and vegetable, and the raw material, which furnishes the means of carrying on the greater part of our valuable and extensive manufactories.——Your correspondent A. whose letter you have inserted on the 23d of August, begins by stating, that it is problematical, how far the effects arising from the high estimation in which agriculture now stands in Great Britain, will be ultimately beneficial. He then proceeds to admit that the agricultural mania, (as he has been pleased to call it,) of the nobility and gentry has produced great improvements. Among these it has presented to the mind of the cultivator a more enlightened view of his art, he has been taught to consider agriculture not merely as an art, but to reflect and reason upo the principles of the science, and that they save unnecessary labour and expense.——These would, in my humble opinion, be of themselves great benefits, and to maintain any doctrine that such advantages could be problematical only, must require very strong arguments, stronger than can be found in Mr. Chalmers, or the

Apes of Louis XV.——The first accusation is that our nobility and gentry descend from their station, to mingle in pursuits unworthy of them, and usurp the place of husbandmen. What is there in the pursuit of agriculture that is to be deemed unworthy? Is the adorning their country seats with the best productions of human art to be extolled, while they are to be debarred from beautifying them by the improvement of their grounds? Are unwholesome swamps and marshes preferable to drained meadows, or barren heaths to verdant sheepwalks? Are briars and bushes browzed by cattle, more noble than woods and plantations, whose luxuriance depends upon being well fenced and preserved with care? Is not the scenery of a whole country rendered more beautiful by the symmetry of the cattle who depasture it? And can any sensible man deny that if with all this utility can be combined, these are noble pursuits?—But it is their province to watch over the interests, and direct the energies of the people. Let me ask your correspondent to what purpose they can more effectually direct the energies of the people than to the improvement of agriculture, or, whether the late Mr. Pitt was less qualified to watch over the interests of the people, because he turned his comprehensive mind to that pursuit, and employed his leisure hours in directing the cultivation of a farm in the county of Kent?——But next comes the grand mischief, the raising the value, and consequently the rent of land. Before we determine whether such effects are produced, let us consider upon what the rent of land depends. The rent of land is the profit to be paid after calculating the expense of production (including taxes, rates, and the interest of capital employed.) It may be deemed that remuneration which the landlord was intitled to for his expenses of building and enclosing. In an early state of society, the best and most productive land was cultivated The quality of such land rendered the produce very great in proportion to the expense of cultivation. As long as the demand was confined to the produce of such land, provisions were cheap, and in great plenty. As the population of the country increased, the demand for food increased with it, and it became necessary to bring into cultivation a secondary sort of land, the produce of which was inferior, while the expense of tillage was greater. This latter quality immediately became the criterion of the value of land, consequently, if the demand enabled the farmer to pay the expenses of tilling such land, that is, if land of a secondary quality could compensate the owner, and afford a fair profit for enclosing, and building upon, the annual expense of production and an interest of capital, equivalent to the ordinary profits of similar concerns, the land of a superior quality would rise in value, in proportion to its superiority in produce over the land of a secondary quality.—The same argument is applicable to every progressive stage of society, and the age in which we live is furnishing us daily proofs, that to support our present and gradually increasing demand for food, we are obliged annually to bring into cultivation the most barren and waste lands of our island. The rent of land then must be fixed at the profit of the worst land that is tilled with advantage, and that accounts for the rent of land in many instances not exceeding from five to ten shillings an acre, a sum scarcely adequate to the inclosing and building upon, while lands of a superior quality are let at five and six pounds, and in most instances the high priced lands are the most profitable to the tenant.——The value of land and consequently the rent, depends upon the demand for food, and the proprietor has no more the means of fixing its value, than the manufacturer of woollen or iron goods.—If I have succeeded in proving this, what injury can the agricultural mania have done to the community at large. Their demand is food, and the nobility and gentry by their superior means of information, by travelling and introducing into their own counties the best practices of others (an advantage which the common farmer whose habits and occupations keep at home, has not the power of obtaining) increase the supply, and while they are endeavouring to augment their own profits, their efforts have a tendency to lessen the price to the community at large by that increase.——But "*they must retire and give preeminence to the upstart but more powerful trader.*" Granted, they must, if idle and inattentive to their own concerns, while the trader is industrious and never one moment losing sight of his own interest, they will be annihilated and their farms will be daily (as is already the case in many instances) purchased by the gains of industry and perseverance. This effect is natural, it is to be avoided only by their becoming equally attentive, and equally industrious. If it is desirable such a race of men as the independent freeholders of Great Britain should remain, it is the agricultural mania alone that can compensate them. But the increase of rent is not the only evil your correspondent apprehends. All the misfortunes of the French revolution are to be expected from

the innocent and rural enjoyments of the nobility and gentry of Great Britain. Never did I so completely differ with any man. I had some opportunity of observing the sentiments of the French, previous to that important crisis, and have ever thought that the non-residence of the great landed proprietors was at that period the greatest misfortune. That it was the cause of that revolution I cannot assert, but that it deprived the country of that check which ought to have been imposed upon the power and mania of the city of Paris, I have never doubted. When the French wished to assimilate their constitution to ours, the greatest loss they experienced was that confidence, which ought to subsist between the landed proprietors and the electors, and caused the introduction of advocates and attorneys as the representatives instead of men who had property to protect. This could never have occurred if the proprietors had resided upon their estates, instead of squandering away their rents at Paris, and when they found it necessary to retire to their own estates, were known only to the peasant by their extortion.——As to his statement of this mania having arisen in the age of Louis XV. every one who knows the disposition of the French, must recollect that the court set the fashions, and whether it were hunting, dress, or shooting, the courtiers were sure to follow it. Fortunate, in my opinion, had it been for them, if it had been attended with those consequences, which would have induced them to reside upon their own estates. —Lastly, he seems to apprehend that the independence of the country gentlemen will be effected by their love of agricultural pursuits. Were a minister of Great Britain so wicked as to wish to render them subservient to the views of despotism, it is not by leaving them to reside in the country, there to judge of his acts impartially, and free from prejudice, but it would be by inducing them to spend their fortunes in London, and by increasing their wants in proportion as they observed the luxuries of others, render them dependent upon himself. He is most independent, who is truly rich, and he is in the truest sense of the word, rich, whose wishes and desires do not exceed his means of gratifying them.—I have been induced to offer these few observations, to endeavour to place this subject in its true light, and to obviate any prejudice which might arise against a most useful and deserving class of men, a prejudice which it is unfortunately the interest of many to encourage. But, it remains to you, Sir, to promote the free discussion by the insertion of all fair arguments on both sides, and to leave the merits of the case to the judgment of a candid and enlightened public.——I am, Sir,—A. D.—*York, August* 29, 1806.

---

### EXEMPTION FROM TAXES.

Sir,—To what you have written concerning exemption from taxes you may if you think fit add the following well-authenticated anecdote.—When Mr. Legge was chancellor of the exchequer, he proposed a tax on placemen with certain exceptions, in which were included the Speaker of the House of Commons and the twelve judges. When the bill for establishing this tax was before the committee of the House of Commons Mr. Onslow, the Speaker, spoke to some such effect as this.—" Mr. Chairman, it is " not my intention to oppose the tax now " under consideratien or indeed to discuss " its expediency or justice. The observa- " tions which I think it my duty to submit " to the committee, relate exclusively to " the clause for enacting certain exemp- " tions. This clause is doubtless intended " as matter of favour to the objects of it, " but I cannot regard it in that light. To " exempt a man from a tax is to preclude " him from contributing his share to the " support of the security and dignity of the " throne, and the prosperity and safety of " his country, If any officer be not suffi- " ciently paid for his services, let his salary " be augmented, but let him not be held " up to mankind as a man exempted from " the common burthens of his countrymen. " In this sentiment, I doubt not, I shall " have the concurrence of my lords the " judges. I can, however, speak only for " myself, and for myself I declare, that if " the bill with this clause be passed into a " law, I shall feel myself under the obliga- " tion of quitting the chair of this house on " the next day; for highly as I have ever " esteemed the honour of filling it, I never " will continue to sit in it, under an exemp- " tion from paying my proportion of those " taxes which the exigency of the state re- " quires to be imposed." X. X.

---

### SINKING FUND.

Sir;—From the observations on the Sinking Fund, made by your correspondent, C. S., in his letters to Mr. Fox, one of which appears in your Register of the 23d instant, I have been induced to look into some of the preceding numbers of the Register, to see what has been advanced by other writers, your correspondents on that subject; in doing which I have discovered, that a writer under the signature of J. T.

has not only had recourse to words to express his sentiments and opinions on this important subject, but has adopted the more certain and unerring mode of demonstration, by the use of figures.—But as this is, a more certain, more clear, and more conspicuous mode of conveying ones ideas, were it can be applied, it at the same time, enables others more readily to detect any errors that may have been committed; (for nothing can be more clear and unalterable, than, that twice two make four) and when we see a man have recourse to this mode of reasoning, it makes an impression very much in favour of his argument; for on the first view of his argument so supported, we are halfe onvinced he must be right. Though this may, and is in many cases, the effect of cursory observation, it will by no means stand the test of serious investigation and solid inquiry.—My habits of life naturally inducing a disposition to be rather a cursory observer of such matters, I must confess, it had the effect abovementioned with me, and so it passed; 'till the extraordinary letter of C. S. to Mr. Fox in the Register, of the above date excited in me a curiosity, to see what his fellow-labourers in the same vineyard had offered on the subject; and there I found this mighty man J. T., of figures, " his thoughts arranged in square battalions, bold to meet the attacks of time and chance, himself a numerous host."——My observations will be directed merely to the postscript of his letter (which is to be seen in the ninth vol. of the Register, page 334), by which I am in hopes I shall be able to point out, and convince him that he has committed an error that upsets the whole of his argument; at the same time, I must, (as he does) bar any quibbling of the small wits, about bonuses, douceurs, and all such like things, and confine my remarks to his words and figures. He says, " it will appear to any person who chooses to make the computation, and nothing can be more easy; that supposing an annual deficiency of 10 millions for 14 years it would increase at interest of 5 per cent., upwards of 205 millions of debt."—Now according to his mode of calculating principle and interest, it might amount to the sum stated by him, viz. 205 millions; but this mode of calculation is highly erroneous, and I believe never entered the brain of any man except himself. Nothing can be more evident, than, that 10 millions borrowed annually for 14 years, would amount to 140 millions, and the interest of 10 millions so borrowed for 14 years, would amount to £52,500,000; making, with the 140 million, a total sum of 192,500,000.—If the nation at the end of the 14 years, then paid back, or redeemed the 140 million so received, no part of the transaction would then remain, but what might be left in the imagination; but if, at the end of 14 years, this 140 million should be funded, the nation would bring on itself the annual charge of 7 million for interest. Now let us see what the Sinking Fund would be doing with the 10 million annually, which this writer proposes to give it, in these 14 years; he admits, that any specific sum, put out at compound interest, will in 14 years double itself; the Sinking Fund, will then at the end of that period, have twenty millions annually at command, which at twenty years purchase, would produce 400,000,000: suppose then it should be the determination of the government to annihilate the Sinking Fund, and continue the interest created by borrowing the 10 million annually for 14 years, which at the end of that period would amount as above stated to 7,000,000 annually, then the difference to the nation would be as 7 to 20, that is the interest upon the national debt, would by the plan proposed by J. T. be reduced from 20 to 7, being a saving annually of 13 millions, by the operation of the Sinking Fund. This I conceive to be the true operation of a Sinking Fund, and the advantage arriving from money employed at compound interest, over that employed in the usual way at simple interest. This writer, J. T., farther says, " the commissioners have redeemed 140 million, and they can only redeem as *much more* within that time;" I suppose he means 14 years: now even this, his own position does not agree with his battalia, for I believe, that as *much more* as 140 will make 280; but his figures produce in that time, only 205 which leaves a balance of 75 in favour of the Sinking Fund; but I do not conceive that the amount of what has been redeemed is, *in this case*, the criterion by which we are to be regulated, no, it is the annual produce of the Sinking Fund we are to consider, and not its aggregate.—The 10 millions appear to me to be a very fair criterion to fix on, by which we are to shew the advantages arising from the Sinking Fund established in this county for the redemption of its national debt. It is quite immaterial what sum is fixed on whether at £10 or 10 millions, its effects will be, no doubt, in proportion to its magnitude: but to make myself understand, if £10 are put out at compound interest, it will in about 14 years double itself; and by the same unerring rule 10 millions would be 20; and therefore it does not appear, to me, to

be necessary to shew the operation of a Sinking Fund (or more properly the advantages from employing money at compound, over that of simple interest), to fix on any specific sum or time, to take any sum, at any time, and apply it to that purpose, it will in 14 years double itself.——I shall now endeavour to shew in figures, what I conceive would be the effect of borrowing 10 millions annually for 14 years, and which is to bear an interest of 5 per cent.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Amount to be borrowed | 1st year | £10,000,000 | Interest on ditto, | 1st year | £ 500,000 |
| Ditto | 2d | 10,000,000 | Ditto | 1st and 2d | 1,000,000 |
| Ditto | 3d | 10,000,000 | Ditto | 1st to 3d | 1,500,000 |
| Ditto | 4th | 10,000,000 | Ditto | 4th | 2,000,000 |
| Ditto | 5th | 10,000,000 | Ditto | 5th | 2,500,000 |
| Ditto | 6th | 10,000,000 | Ditto | 6th | 3,000,000 |
| Ditto | 7th | 10,000,000 | Ditto | 7th | 3,500,000 |
| Ditto | 8th | 10,000,000 | Ditto | 8th | 4,000,000 |
| Ditto | 9th | 10,000,000 | Ditto | 9th | 4,500,000 |
| Ditto | 10th | 10,000,000 | Ditto | 10th | 5,000,000 |
| Ditto | 11th | 10,000,000 | Ditto | 11th | 5,500,000 |
| Ditto | 12th | 10,000,000 | Ditto | 12th | 6,000,000 |
| Ditto | 13th | 10,000,000 | Ditto | 13th | 6,500,000 |
| Ditto | 14th | 10,000,000 | Ditto | 14th | 7,000,000 |
| | | £140,000,000 | | | £52,000,000 |

The above I think will shew what would be the effect of borrowing 10 millions annually for 14 years.——If a single 10 million are borrowed for 14 years at 5 per cent., the interest during that time would amount to 7 million; the next year borrow 10 million more, the interest for that sum in 13 years, would amount to, 6,500,000; and so on borrowing annually 10 million for 14 years, at which time it would be found 140 million had been received, and 52,500,000, would have been paid as interest on that sum, instead as your correspondent J. T. states, have created a debt 205 million.—The Sinking Fund may not inaptly be compared to man in his origin and progress in this world, with one exception, viz. that the Sinking Fund carries itself the germins of renovation, and that of man the seeds of his own dissolution) for when he first enters it, what a helpless, and useless thing he is, but by being nursed and properly taken care of, his strength and power increase with a velocity incredible, when his infantine abilities are taken into consideration.—I am, Sir, your humble Servant, X. T. *London, 29th August,* 1306.

---

### CLAIMS ON AMERICA.

Sir,——As your correspondent A. B., in your Weekly Political Register of the 2d instant, appears to be an advocate for the commissioners appointed by act of parliament, under the convention with the United States of America, and privy to their proceedings, I inclose you my appeal to the unerring tribunal of an impartial public, from their decision on my claim; wherein you will see that the Board have superseded the moral obligations of my debts, which were not *extinguished,* but only *suspended* by the war; and *revived* on the restoration of peace, by the law of nations: that they have not paid a proper regard to the public faith, solemnly pledged by Sir Henry Clinton's proclamation of 3d March, 1780, in virtue of letters patent under the great seal, promising persons in my situation, the *most effectual countenance, protection, and support*; with which promise that decision is utterly irreconcileable: that they have equally disregarded the statute of the 30th of his present Majesty, chap. 34, although expressly descriptive of, and applicable to, my case: that they have plainly deviated from their *own resolution* in Andrew Allen's case; which resolution comprehends every feature of mine: that, after my exhibiting, pursuant to order, indisputable evidence of my debts, amounting, inclusive of interest, to upwards of £25,000 sterling; as well as of the solvency of my debtors or their estates; the Board have finally deprived me of the moral and political benefit of the treaties of peace and amity, which, by the law of nations, ought to be interpreted according to the *state things happened to be in, at the time of those treaties, as their legitimate state;* and, consequently, included me and every other British subject, and *bonâ fide* creditor, when they were concluded: and, that in thus depriving me of the moral and political benefit of those treaties, they have assumed to themselves a power, unknown to the constitution, of dispensing with the law of the land; of which the law of nations is unque-

tionably an essential part; although the exercise of that power has been so often reprobated in the history in this country: and have moreover extended that power to impugn national treaties, which ought to be held sacred and inviolate ——You will also see, by the appeal, that the *ostensible cause* of the dismission of my claim, is, my having returned to Carolina during the war, to prevent the ruin of my family and fortune, and taken an oath of allegiance to the existing government. But my return to that country, although strongly recommended by the then Secretary of State, without any application on my part, was not adopted until I consulted the King's Commissioners at New York, who approved of the measure, and procured me a flag of truce for the purpose. And as these were the only organs through whom the sentiments of this government could be obtained in so important a matter, their error in judgment, if any, ought not to be imputed to me. And as to my submitting to the imperious necessity of taking the oath of allegiance as above, under an ordnance passed in my absence; it was not considered in so obnoxious a light by the Secretary of State, as he blamed those who left the country to avoid taking an oath of allegiance and abjuration. But even supposing, by my return to the country, and taking the oath of allegiance to the existing government, or from any other circumstance of my conduct during the usurpation, *any criminality* could possibly attach to me; the above proclamation expressly pardoned it, as well as promised the most effectual countenance, protection, and support to those who should speedily return to their duty and allegiance. To the benefit of which promise, I am, by all laws, divine and human, clearly intitled, as I strictly conformed to that proclamation in every respect; and, relying on the public faith of it, submitted to banishment, confiscation of estate, (debts excepted) and all the calamities of war; and persevered in my allegiance until the conclusion of the treaty of peace; by the 4th article whereof, 'it is agreed, that creditors on 'either side shall meet with no lawful im-'pediments to the recovery of the full value, 'in sterling money, of all *bonâ fide* debts 'heretofore contracted.' At which time I was a British subject and *bonâ fide* creditor, and have continued so ever since. And the plain object of the 6th article of the treaty of amity was to carry that article of the treaty of peace into faithful execution, in behalf of the British merchants and *others his Majesty's subjects*. Notwithstanding all which, after near twenty-three years painful suspense, I am now left destitute of any prospect of relief: although, even admitting there could be an existing doubt in the case, it is effectually obviated by the above statute, which expressly and positively intitles those, '*who took oaths to the American states, but* '*afterwards joined the British*,' to compensation for their losses. And the resolution of the Board in Andrew Allen's case plainly corresponds with the statute.—— Having more fully and clearly proved, in my appeal, that the ground of the decision is untenable, it was reasonable to suppose some *substantial* arguments would have been offered to the consideration of an impartial public in support of it: but the Board have taken refuge in the plenitude of their power, by observing a profound silence, which is oftener a cloak for the most absurd and jejune positions, than it is a proof of accurate judgment; as most candid men, in their public and private capacities, pride themselves in the disclosure of the reasons and principles whereon it is founded, from motives of celebrity and applause. However, as your correspondent A. B. seems to be a friend to publicity, I trust, the public will now be gratified with a vindication of this injurious decision, by so zealous an advocate and panegyrist. But if I should find myself disappointed, as I am confident of your inflexible disposition to resist injustice and oppression, from whatever source they may originate, I shall leave you to any comment on the occasion, which your independent spirit and ingenuity may suggest: and am, Sir, &c.——AN AMERICAN LOYALIST.

*Lambs Conduit Street, Aug.* 13, 1806.

## FOREIGN OFFICIAL PAPER.

DUTCH PRESS.——*Proclamation issued by the King of Holland.*

Louis Napoleon, by the grace of God, &c. We have determined, and determine by these: 1. The daily paper called the Amsterdam Evening Journal, shall be suppressed. The conductor shall not obtain permission to be employed again in any periodical work, having pretended to be the writer of a paper under our authority; and having spoken, in his publication of July 24, in a light and unjustifiable manner of governments with whom we are at peace. 2. Since no subject is permitted to speak in the name of his sovereign, and as it is unlawful for any private person to censure the acts of different governments, otherwise than in speech, and this entirely within his own domestic circle, every conductor of any printed work, who shall act in opposition to this law, shall be punished as an open disturber of the public tranquillity, and a transgressor of his duties to his sovereign.—C. J. VAN BRAKEL. Given at Mentz, August 6, 1806.

inted by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bahaw, Bow Street Covent Garden; where former Numbers may be had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall Mall.